

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 * * *

5 NATHAN WILLIAMS,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 BRIAN E. WILLIAMS, SR., *et al.*,

9 Respondents.
10

Case No. 3:17-cv-00365-HDM-WGC

ORDER

11
12 In this habeas corpus action, on August 6, 2018, the Court ruled on the
13 respondents' motion to dismiss, granting it in part and denying it in part, dismissing certain
14 of the claims of the *pro se* petitioner, Nathan Williams, and ordering the respondents to
15 file an answer responding to the remaining claims. See Order entered August 6, 2018
16 (ECF No. 26). Respondents' answer was due on November 5, 2018. See *id.*

17 On November 5, 2018, Respondents filed a motion for an extension of time (ECF
18 No. 27), requesting a 45-day extension of time, to December 20, 2018, for the answer.
19 This would be the first extension of this deadline. Respondents' counsel states that the
20 extension of time is necessary because of her obligations in other cases. The Court finds
21 that Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for
22 the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time requested.

23 The Court will grant the motion for extension of time. However, in light of the
24 amount of time respondents will have had to xxx (xxx days), the Court will not look
25 favorably upon any motion to further extend this deadline.

26 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time
27 (ECF No. 27) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until December 20, 2018, to file their
28 answer.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, after the respondents file an answer, the petitioner will have 60 days to file a reply.

DATED THIS 6th day of November, 2018.

Howard D McKibben

HOWARD D. McKIBBEN,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE